DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 163 CS 002 327

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.
TITLE [Doctoral Training Program Concerns, Student Publishers of Reading Materials and 1974 Doctoral Dissertations on Reading.]
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 33p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v2 n3 Entire Issue Jul 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Doctoral Programs; *Doctoral Theses; Employment Opportunities; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Publications; *Reading Instruction; Reading Materials; Reading Programs; *Reading Research; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

The "Epistle" is the publication forum of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators, which is a special-interest group of the International Reading Association. In this issue "Early Publishers: Characteristics of Graduate Students Who Publish Reading Material" by Catherine Scheader and Lee Mountain focuses on 29 graduate students who had published either in educational journals or with commercial publishers. Graduate students in reading who published their work tended to be experienced teachers, employed either full time or part time, and enrolled in doctoral programs rather than masters degree programs. Enrollment in a course which prepared graduate students to publish, also proved to be a significant factor. In "Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1974," Robert A. Palmatier and Ronald Rood offer an analysis of doctoral theses topics, sources, populations, statistical methods, and designs as communicated through researcher-prepared abstracts. (College Instruction: The Old Do As I Say Not As I Do Game," by Deborah De Nicolo and Jane Domaracki, is a student comment on graduate instruction. Regular features are "Movers," "Exchange," and "For the Time Capsule." (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

epistle

ED116163

vol. 2, no. 3

july 1975

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators

International Reading Association

CS002327

EPISTLE
VOL. 2, NO. 3

Editor

Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

Assistant Editor

Kemble Oliver
University of Georgia

Advisory Editors

Lawrence Carrillo
San Francisco State University

Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri - Kansas City

H. Alan Robinson
Hofstra University

Editorial Assistant

Marilyn Lamarre
University of Georgia

Correspondence: EPISTLE
Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Professors of Reading
Teacher Educators

Additional copies of
EPISTLE are available
for $1.50 to members
and for $2.00 to
non-members.

Printer of EPISTLE is the
University of Georgia
Central Duplicating Service
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dear Colleagues:

In this issue EPISTLE continues to focus on issues of concern to individuals working in graduate reading programs. Those attending the third annual meeting of the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators in New York accorded EPISTLE unanimous support. They encouraged continuation of the effort to provide information vital to the improvement of graduate programs in reading.

A discussion of the job market centered around concern that new positions in teacher training may be decreasing in the coming years. The large potential for jobs in the rapidly expanding area of college-level reading improvement programs was explored. Concern was expressed that jobs in this area have been considered by many professors and students as "second choice" placement. The editor of EPISTLE was directed to plan a future issue on the training needs and types of positions in this job market area. The next issue of EPISTLE has been planned to meet that request.

Martin Kling of Rutgers University discussed the problem of dwindling financial support for graduate students in reading. Numerous suggestions were given to Dr. Kling for the guidelines he is suggesting for development of a federally funded fellowship program. As Congress begins to consider such funding, you may want to advise your Congressmen of your concern and support for this program. Dr. Kling has promised to provide EPISTLE with an update on his plans.

Innovations in doctoral training programs were discussed by those present. The major concern was that of a lack of information concerning the approach of various universities to training demands, especially in the area of competency based programs. Dick Allington, of the State University of New York at Albany, was asked to prepare a pre-convention institute proposal on the topic for the Anaheim Conference. Also, a future issue of EPISTLE is being planned to deal with the same theme.

PRTE, according to Secretary/Treasurer Warren Wheelock, of the University of Missouri - Kansas City, is financially "in the black." Low publication costs resulting from the generous support and cooperation of the Johnson County Library Printing Department (Kansas) and the University of Georgia Central Duplicating Service enabled the charter membership term to be extended through June 30,

1975. The new membership year will run from July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976.

The lead article in this issue of EPISTLE includes an article concerning a program designed to increase the publishing prowess of graduates. A second article continues the exploration into aspects of doctoral dissertations in reading. Also, in an effort to provide consumer views, a graduate student-authored article on doctoral programs is included. Regular features MOVERS, EXCHANGE, FOR THE TIME CAPSULE and ABOUT THE AUTHORS complete the issue.

EPISTLE still needs friends! Articles on any concern relevant to graduate programs in reading are solicited. Graduate students and their professors are encouraged to use EPISTLE to air their views and concerns. Also, to keep readers informed of activities and changes, items for MOVERS, JOB REPORT (returning in the next issue), and FOR THE TIME CAPSULE are needed. More member/subscribers are also essential to continuation of the effort. Make use of the tear sheet in the centerfold of this issue to convey information and membership applications.

Best,

Bob

Robert A. Palmatier
Editor

Volume 2, Number 3 July 1975

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum
of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators

A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

CONTENTS

Articles

Early Publishers: Characteristics of Graduate Students Who Publish Reading Material
Catherine Scheader and Lee Mountain

Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1974
Robert A. Palmatier and Ronald Rood

College Instruction: The Old Do As I Say Not As I Do Game
Deborah De Nicolo and Jane Domaracki

Regular Features

EXCHANGE

MOVERS

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Early Publishers

Characteristics of Graduate Students Who Publish Reading Materials

Catherine Scheader
Matawan, New Jersey

and

Lee Mountain
Professor, College of Education, University of Houston

The saying, "Publish or perish," has long been meaningful to college professors of reading. But what about their graduate students?

Some graduate students start publishing before completing the doctorate, or even the master's degree. They publish reading texts, workbooks, teachers' guides, scripts for tapes, book reviews and games, as well as journal articles (Scheader, 1971). But those "early publishers" are certainly a minority, though an influential one.

Very little is known about the characteristics of those graduate students in reading who become early publishers. In fact, a literature search proved early publishers to be a virgin population for investigation.

In order to find out about this group, it was necessary first to locate a population of early publishers and second to identify their characteristics regarding experience, age, employment and graduate studies. A questionnaire designed to gather this data was mailed to all 166 graduate students in reading at one university. This number represented the total population enrolled in the reading program. After follow-up, responses were tabulated from 95% of the subjects. The questionnaire data for each item were analyzed under one of two conditions: X^2 test of independence and, where numbers were too small, percentages.

Of the 150 graduate students in reading who returned the questionnaire, almost 20% had published either in educational journals or with commercial publishers. An additional 38% wrote unpublished materials, largely for use by other teachers within their school systems. But the 29 graduate students who had actually broken into print were the focal population for this investigation. They were the early publishers whose characteristics can now be reported.

Their characteristics can be described under four headings--

experience, age, employment, and graduate studies. The questionnaires yielded definite findings about this one group of early publishers in regard to these areas.

Experience

Graduate students in reading who published their work tended to be experienced teachers. Those with more than five years of teaching experience published significantly more than those with fewer than five years of teaching experience. Table 1 displays the differences in experience of the population.

Table 1

Relation Between Teaching Experience & Publishing N=150

Experience	Published	Unpublished	Total
	Obs. Exp.	Obs. Exp.	
More than 5 Years	26 (17.4)	64 (72.6)	90
Less than 5 Years	3 (11.6)	57 (48.4)	60
Total	29	121	150

$X^2 = 13.174$*

*Significant at the .001 level.

Age

Age was not a factor in whether a graduate student published or did not publish. The number of students who were under age 35 and who published was not significantly different from those who were over age 35. This agrees with a study of psychologists which reported that no relation existed between their ages and whether they published (Lehman, 1966).

This earlier study speculated on the pressure to publish as a factor in the number of psychologists under 35 who were reporting their work in professional journals. Table 2 shows the age factor.

Table 2

Relationship Between Age And Publishing Behavior N = 150

Age	Published	Unpublished	Total
	Obs. Exp.	Obs. Exp.	
Under 35	11 (15.7)	70 (65.3)	81
Over 35	18 (13.3)	51 (55.7)	69
Total	29	121	150

$X^2 = 3.803$*

*Not significant at the .01 level.

Employment

Two thirds of the graduate students who published were employed either full time or part time as teachers at levels ranging from elementary school to college. A larger percentage of the college teachers published than those who taught in secondary or elementary schools or those who were not employed. Although not statistically significant, this data seemed to reflect the greater opportunity for a pressure upon teachers at higher levels of education to publish, reported in an earlier study of college teachers. (Balyeat, 1963). Employment data is shown on Table 3.

Graduate Studies

The graduate students in reading who published had received more education than those who did not publish. A little more than two-thirds of the early publishers were enrolled in doctoral rather than master's degree programs. The early publishers gave more consideration

Table 3

Percentages of Those Who Published and Those Who Did Not Publish, In 5 Employment Categories N = 150

Position	Published		Unpublished		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Elementary Teacher	7	11.49	54	88.51	61
Secondary Teacher	4	23.53	13	76.47	17
College Teacher	8	42.11	11	57.89	19
Other than Teacher	8	33.33	16	66.67	24
Not Empl'd	2	6.90	27	93.10	29
Total	29	19.33	121	80.67	150

Table 4

Relationship Between Specific Preparation & Publishing N = 150

Preparation	Published	Unpublished	Total
	Obs. Exp.	Obs. Exp.	
Course	15 (5.2)	12 (21.8)	27
No Course	14 (23.8)	109 (99.2)	123
Total	29	121	150

$X^2 = 27.92^*$ * Significant at the .001 level.

4

to readability factors (subheads, vocabulary load, sentence length, etc.) than did the group of graduate students who also wrote but had not yet published.

The most highly significant difference between early publishers and unpublished graduate students was in the area of specific course-work in preparation for publishing. More than half of the students who elected a course in developing materials for publication did publish their work. In contrast, less than one-sixth of those who did not have this specific preparation published.

The course in developing materials examined both professional and commercial publication outlets. For journal articles, students explored topics related to their work as teachers or to their graduate studies. They strove to match type of article (research, anecdotal, literature-based) with journal readership.

For commercial publications, the graduate students surveyed the publishers listed in Literary Market Place and suggested areas for new curriculum materials. Each student developed a proposal, which included an overview of his material, citing need and supportive research. An outline and sample pages were also developed. Students were encouraged to submit their proposals to a number of publishers for consideration. They drafted cover letters and resumes to send along with their proposals so that their correspondence would truly introduce them to their prospective publishers.

Table 4 reports data on the relationship between those who took a course in preparing materials for publication and those who did not.

It would seem that graduate students can profit from course work in how to prepare material for journal editors and commercial publishers. Perhaps this specific preparation should be offered more widely in graduate programs in reading.

"Publish or perish" is certainly true for ideas, and many graduate students in reading have ideas worthy of publication. So more power to the early publishers!

References

Balyeat, R.E. Factors related to the promotion of university personnel. Athens, Ga.: Cooperative Research Project S-107, University of Ga. Cited in Lewis, L.S. Journal of Higher Education. 1967, 38, 85-89.

Lehman, H.C. The psychologist's most creative years. American Psychologist. 1966, 21, 363-9.

Scheader, Catherine. Publishing Behavior of Graduate Students in Reading. Unpublished study. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., May, 1971.

An Analysis of Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1974

Robert A. Palmatier
Ronald Rood
University of Georgia

When considering research and trends in reading education the large number of doctoral dissertations completed each year must be included. In 1974 Dissertation Abstracts reported 371 studies dealing with reading. This report, like a similar study (Palmatier and Austin, 1975) of dissertations reported in 1973, analyzes the sources and types of doctoral research being done in reading. No effort is made to evaluate dissertation studies, rather, this report presents data on dissertation sources, topics, populations, statistical methods, and designs as communicated through researcher-prepared abstracts.

Method

All volumes of Dissertation Abstracts for 1974 were searched. Since no index for reading is provided, relevant studies were identified by title and by skimming abstracts where titles alone were ambiguous. Studies selected cover a range of topics including reading instruction, reading tests, teacher training in reading, study skills, adult literacy, and the relationship of other variables to reading. Topics dealing with literary analysis and literary techniques were excluded unless they were related to student reading competence or instruction.

A check list, slightly modified from the form used for the study of 1973 material, was used to collect data. Check list items included source, population, grouping, research types, testing, statistics, results, and research topics. The check list was completed for each of 371 abstracts selected. Information was then key-punched and analyzed by computer at the University of Georgia Computer Center. Version 5.8 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, developed at the Northwestern University Computer Center was used.

Results

The kinds and quantity of doctoral dissertations emanating from our several graduate programs should be of potential interest to professors and students now engaged in graduate study in reading. The kinds of dissertation topics often indicate the nature of a par-

Table 1

Institutions for Whom Six or More Doctoral Dissertation Studies on Reading Were Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

School	Number
University of Southern California	15
University of Pittsburgh	14
Syracuse University	12
University of Wisconsin	12
Temple University	10
University of Minnesota	10
Boston University	9
Indiana University	9
Columbia University	8
Hofstra University	8
Lehigh University	8
State University of New York at Buffalo	8
University of Georgia	8
Florida State University	7
Oklahoma State University	7
University of Connecticut	7
University of Northern Colorado	7
University of Southern Mississippi	6

ticular graduate program, while the quantity suggests the size of the program. During 1974, a total of 371 dissertations involving reading were produced by 94 graduate institutions. Eighteen schools each contributed six or more studies. The largest number of dissertations reported by a single institution was 15 (see Table 1 for frequency data on the 18 highest producers.)

The names of professors guiding the preparation of doctoral dissertations is also of major interest. From a total of 239 major professors identified, eight professors guided three or more of the doctoral studies reported in 1974. As shown in Table 2, the largest number of dissertations in 1974 completed under the direction of a single major professor is six. In 133 studies Dissertation Abstracts did not list a major professor. A mail request for this information reduced the number of unidentified professors to 68. Professors responsible for guiding the remaining dissertations could not be identified.

Table 2

Professors Reported During 1974 in Dissertation Abstracts as Directors of Three or More Doctoral Studies

Professor	School	Number
Smith, Edwin	Florida State University	6
McNinch, George	University of Southern Mississippi	5
Otto, Wayne	University of Wisconsin	5
Ray, Darrel	Oklahoma State University	5
Kender, Joseph	Lehigh University	4
Hill, Walter	State University of New York-Buffalo	3
Robinson, H. Alan	Hofstra University	3
Van Rockel, Byron	Michigan State University	3

The length of a typical dissertation is usually of interest to future dissertation writers. The reading dissertations reported in Dissertation Abstracts during 1974 averaged 153 pages in length. All but eight of the 371 studies reported the number of pages in the dissertation.

There were 201 (54%) Ph.D. and 169 (46%) Ed.D. dissertations listed in the abstracts. Whatever the possible value difference, it does not seem to increase significantly a choice in either direction.

The type of research used in doctoral dissertations in reading seems limited to three major types. Correlational studies were reported in 101 dissertations; descriptive procedures in 54; and experimental methods in 153. In only two cases was a historical study reported. Table 3 shows frequency and percentage for the types of research reported in 1974.

Table 3

Types of Research Utilized in Dissertation Studies on Reading Reported During 1974 in Dissertation Abstracts

Type	Number	Percent
Correlational	101	33
Descriptive	54	18
Experimental	153	50
Historical	2	0.7

Reading researchers may select from a wide range of potential subjects. Analysis of the dissertation abstracts for populations used indicated that primary and intermediate level students served most often as subjects. The next most frequently utilized population groups (6 to 10% categories) in the studies reported were junior high students, high school students, pre-schoolers, and teachers. The fact that eighty percent of the studies focused on school children below the tenth grade level is surprising, given the high concern for high school and adult readers in current media reports. Perhaps lack of attention to these groups in doctoral and other reading research is somehow related to the condition which has drawn so much public attention. Table 4 shows a detailed breakdown of the population data by categories. The fact that the population data does not account for all of the dissertations completed in 1974 is due to forty studies which did not report or did not use a research population.

Research design and statistical treatment of data are major concerns to those developing dissertation research plans. The abstracts of the studies published in 1974 suggest that limited attention was given to protective devices such as control groups (30%), random subject selection (14%), random treatment assignment

Table 4

Population Groups Used in Doctoral Dissertation Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Population	Frequency	Percent
Primary (1-3)	114	38
Intermediate (4-6)	96	32
Junior High (7-()	31	10
High School	24	8
Pre-school	18	6
Teachers	18	6
Four-year College	13	4
Junior College	7	2
Clinic Clients	4	1
Other	3	1
Graduate Students	2	0.7
Non-college/Post High School	1	0.3
Adult Basic Education	0	0.0

(16%), and matched groups (6%). Since only sixty percent reported the use of control procedures, it is surprising to note that no researcher indicated his design to be of a type not requiring such controls. Table 5 gives frequencies reported for each area. In this report it is assumed that, if controls were not mentioned in the abstract, they were not used in the original study.

Table 5

Design Aspects Reported for Reading Research in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

Aspect	Frequency	Percent
Control Groups	90	30
Random Subject Selection	41	14
Random Treatment Assignment	48	16
Matched Groups	18	6
Case Study	0	0
Other	0	0

Most research designs include the testing of subjects. Analysis of the dissertation abstracts for types of testing used indicated that more than one-third (39%) of the studies used a pre-test/post-test design. Over half (58%) of the researchers relied on standardized test instruments for data collection. Two other sizeable test categories were researcher-constructed instruments (32%) and informal tests (19%). See Tables 6 and 7 for details on the testing design and instrument types. That neither table accounts evenly for 100% of the studies is due to the fact that no information on testing design was given in abstracts of several studies and to the use of more than one type of test in several studies.

Another aspect in the evaluation of research designs is the statistics utilized in hypothesis testing. Correlation, Analysis of Variance, and Analysis of Covariance are the most frequently reported statistical methods. Frequencies for these and other methods are shown in Table 8. Many studies use more than one statistic in hypothesis testing, causing utilization to total more than 100 percent.

Graduate students are usually interested in achieving research

Table 6

Testing Designs of Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

Design	Frequency	Percent
Pre-test Only	14	5
Post-test Only	39	13
Pre- and Post-Tests	119	39
Delayed Post-Test	15	5
Design Specified	2	0.7

Table 7

Types of Testing Instruments Used in Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

Type	Frequency	Percent
Standardized	175	58
Prior Research Validated	19	6
Researcher-Constructed	97	32
Informal	59	19

results which are statistically significant. However, 56 (15%) researchers reported finding only non-significant results. Eighty-four (23%) of the dissertation writers reported only significant results. Findings of mixed results accounted for nearly half of the total (172 studies, 46%).

Table 8

Test Statistics Used in Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

Statistic	Frequency	Percent
Correlation	85	28
Analysis of Variance	78	26
Analysis of Covariance	60	20
Simple t	43	14
Simple F	18	6
Multivariate	11	4
Chi Square	11	4
Factor Analysis	10	3
Multiple Correlation	9	3

The final factor investigated in this analysis was the topic under investigation. Table 9 details the frequency of each of the forty-three categories hypothesized by the principal author to be sufficiently inclusive to cover all potential dissertation topics; however, 85 (28%) of the studies reported topics not included in the breakdown used.

In spite of the number of topics classified in the general category of "other," certain clear indications concerning areas most studied, or least studied, are possible. Methodology comparisons and test validation accounted for the largest number of specified categories of study. Also high in the ranking were material validation, comprehension, disadvantaged learners, instructional content, attitudes, beginning reading, word recognition, and visual factors. Significant for their low rankings were adult literacy,

professional certification, critical reading, corrective reading, in-service teacher training, and advanced organizers. Table 9 gives the frequency and percent for the complete topical breakdown. Inspection of Table 9 demonstrates the difficulty of defending the 43 categories stipulated by the principal author as either sufficiently exclusive or inclusive categories. Categories often overlap, and studies often deal with more than one category.

Table 9

Topics of Study for Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1974

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Other	85	28
Methodology Comparison	84	28
Test Validation	82	27
Material Validation	68	22
Comprehension	66	22
Disadvantaged Learners	63	21
Instructional Content	63	21
Attitudes	54	18
Beginning Reading	46	15
Word Recognition	39	13
Visual Factors	36	12
Auditory Factors	28	9
Remedial	28	9
Readiness	26	9
Theory Development	26	9
Cross Cultural	24	8

Table 9 (cont.)

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Modality Factors	24	8
Content Area	22	7
Neurological Organization	21	7
Linguistics	18	6
Language Development	16	5
Teacher Behavior	16	5
Developmental	15	5
Listening	13	4
Intelligence	12	4
Pre-service Teacher Training	12	4
Readability	12	4
Associative Learning	11	4
Cognitive Structure	11	4
Program Survey	11	4
Phonic Generalizations	10	3
Reading Rate	9	3
Vocabulary	8	3
Interests	7	2
Study Skills	7	2
Individualized	6	2
Physical Relationships	6	2
Advanced Organizers	4	1
In-service Teacher Training	4	1

Table 9 (cont.)

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Corrective	3	1
Critical Reading	3	1
Professional Certification	3	1
Adult Literacy	1	.3

Summary

Collection and analysis of the data obtainable on reading dissertations reported during 1974 in Dissertation Abstracts suggest doctoral research trends in several areas. The 371 abstracts selected because of their relationship to reading education involved dissertations developed at 94 graduate institutions. Only eight of 239 major professors guided more than two of the dissertation studies reported in 1974. The type of doctoral degree earned by the reading dissertation authors was nearly equally divided between the Ph.D. and Ed. D.

Aspects which offer evidence of rather wide consensus include: 1) primary, intermediate, and junior high grade level students as the most prevalent population; 2) experimental and correlational studies represented eighty-three percent of the total; 3) rather limited controls were used in research designs; 4) there was a clear preference for using standardized data collection instruments; 5) over half of the studies used Correlation (28%) or Analysis of Variance (26%) to secure a test statistic; and 6) results most often included a mixture of significant and non-significant findings. A mean length of 153 pages was also determined from averaging all studies for which page length was reported.

A look at the abstracts of reading dissertations revealed methodology comparisons and test validation to be the most frequently specified topics. That adult literacy was the topic of only one study indicated a gap between dissertation research and a current issue of great public concern.

Readers should be cautious in interpreting these findings. First, the data on which analysis is based were drawn from the dissertation abstracts prepared by each researcher rather than from an analysis of the dissertation itself. Second, findings cover only those studies reported in Dissertation Abstracts during the 1974 calendar year. Conclusions about trends must be tentative until

further analyses of output for other years can be related to these findings. Finally, the analysis instrument bears the design bias of the principal author and emphasizes information thought to be most important by him.

Consideration of the results even in light of the necessary cautions stated above still provides some pertinent and valid information. First, potential dissertation authors and major professors may use the design and topical information to compare the direction of their efforts. Second, personal conclusions about studies developed locally can be evaluated in light of the sizeable cross-section analyzed. Of greater importance, perhaps, is that the information on topics of study may serve to motivate future research in areas neglected by previous doctoral dissertation research.

References

DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS, Ann Arbor Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 1974.

Palmatier, R. A. and Austin, Ellen. "Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1973: An Analysis." EPISTLE, Vol. 2, no. 2 (March 1975), pp. 11-20.

College Instruction: The Old Do As I Say Not As I Do Game

Deborah De Nicolo
Jane Domaracki
State University of New York at Albany

It has often been said that teachers tend to teach their students in the manner in which they themselves have previously been taught (Leese, Clark, and Kelley, 1970). Fortunately, for the millions of children in American schools, this is not always the case. As Austin and Morrison (1963) have suggested, teachers often perform better than we have a right to expect, considering their training.

There is currently widespread concern for the need to improve the competency of public school teachers in their ability to meet the needs of the individual children placed in their classrooms (Durkin, 1974; Ryan (ed.), 1975). It is disturbing to find that the lack of personalized instruction continues to be a criticism of public school reading practice. Lack of progress in personalizing instruction, as first noted eleven years ago in The First R (Austin and Morrison, 1963), should be especially disconcerting to those involved with teacher training. Perhaps it will be insightful to examine the preparation given to public school teachers at the college level. Although students in teacher training programs rarely have characteristic abilities and expectations in common, personalization of instruction is a practice that is hardly ever incorporated at the collegiate level. To the uninitiated, this might appear to be the classic problem of do as I say, not as I do. Prospective teachers sit in undergraduate and graduate classes where professors tirelessly espouse the imperativeness of personalizing instruction, while employing the lecture method for the entire class. As Leese, Clark, and Kelley (1970) have noted, "teachers at all levels notoriously repeat those practices long since rejected on rational and empirical grounds, but nowhere do they seem to do so quite so obviously as at the college level."

In teaching such a variety of students, the college professor's task is not unlike that faced by the public school teacher. It seems reasonable to assume that the individual needs and abilities of college students are no less diverse than those found in a homogeneously grouped classroom. In point of fact, they may be greater, for college students differ greatly in terms of what they can contribute to their own learning and in their desired educational outcomes. Further, today's college students are less likely to be as passive about the need for instruction meeting their specific expectations as the elementary or secondary school children. If we assume that personalization of

instruction is a viable goal to improve learning in elementary and secondary classrooms, there is no reason to believe that individualization should stop there. If the college instructor wishes to be an effective teacher, he must consider his audience and be willing to modify his instructional stance accordingly.

Personalization of college instruction would provide the prospective teacher with training in the specific areas which he/she needs in order to become a competent professional, while also offering a model to this end in the person of the professor. The competency based teacher education (CBTE) movement is a first step in this direction. However, unless such a program involves change from the traditional lecture method, and addresses itself to essential and useful content, student needs are not likely to be met as specifically as they might. Although few would disagree with the statement that designing instruction to meet the specific needs of students is a desirable goal of education, such a philosophy is rarely evident in teaching at the college level for a variety of reasons, among which is the collegiate emphasis on research rather than teaching.

The dichotomy between teaching and research is quite real. Scholarly endeavor and research in one's field is often viewed as the primary responsibility of the college professor. By implication, therefore, instruction of students becomes a secondary consideration. Status and tenure within colleges and universities are gained through research and publication, as witnessed by the well known "publish or perish" philosophy. The reward and tenure systems of these institutions are based primarily upon the number of articles and books published and upon grants received. Student evaluation of professors and teaching abilities generally carry too little weight in the tenure consideration. Some of this is understandable since universities gain status, and thereby, support money through the research efforts of their faculties. But, professors are supposedly hired to teach and the reward system fails to reflect this goal. Therefore, to ask a professor to emphasize and upgrade his instructional abilities, taking time which otherwise could be devoted to research, is akin to asking him/her to commit professional and economic suicide under the present institutional value system. Leese, Clark, and Kelley (1970) address this issue pointing out that change is possible.

> It is a fact that a fair number of academics are willing and would like to study teaching, when they have colleagues' and administrative support to do so,...and when higher educational institutions more vigorously acknowledge and reward evidence of performance and growth in effectiveness in teaching, they will elect the task (1970).

If college professors continue to be expected to both teach and conduct research, it seems logical that colleges and universities can and should support both types of endeavor. Currently,the academic community does not regard teaching responsibilities as being as important as research work. If the quality of college teaching is to improve, significant changes will have to be made in institutional philosophy regarding the role of the professor and the relative importance attached to each aspect of this role.

Spitzer (in press) suggests that the debate over the research and teaching dichotomy is perhaps one of the most fruitless controversies which has confronted the American university because it has caused much bitterness and has done little to rectify the situation. He views research and teaching as complimentary activities, both needed by society. Therefore, we must cease to view research and teaching as independent, unrelated entities but rather, we must focus upon how to incorporate both for the benefit of the students and the profession.

One adoptable measure for reducing this problem of research versus teaching would be to place equal emphasis on each area in the determination of tenure and professional stature. Since research and writing have an established reward system (i.e., payment for publication and/or grant money in addition to the status and respect achieved among colleagues) another approach would be to institute a similar reward system for instructional improvement and teaching.

It might be argued that some colleges and universities have reward systems for outstanding teaching but, in the true sense of the word system, this is hardly the case if only one or two rewards are offered per year and number of publications produced by nominees are considered. A reward system should include efforts of nominees toward course improvement and student evaluations. Also, the rewards and awards for good teaching should be part of the tenure and status systems of colleges and universities if they are to have any real meaning. Although neither provides a complete answer, similar measures may begin to solve the dual problem of teacher preparation and actual teaching with the public schools. If American education is to advance into the twenty-first century at the "degree of competency that our society should expect" (Heilman, 1967, p. 365), it must begin at the college level. This will require a firm commitment from both professors and administrators to provide the type of instruction and reward for it which will allow--as stated in the motto of the State University of New York--"each to become all he is capable of being."

References

Austin, Mary C. and Morrison, Coleman. The First R: the Harvard Report on Reading in Elementary Schools, New York: MacMillan, 1967.

Durkin, Dolores. "After Ten Years: Where Are We Now in Reading", Reading Teacher, December, 1974, p. 262-67.

Heilman, Arthur W. Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading, 2nd Ed. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1967.

Leese, Joseph; Clark, Richard M. and Kelley, Robert. Facilitating Study of College Teaching. Albany, New York: Center for Curriculum Research and Services, 1970.

Ryan, Kevin (Ed.) Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Spitzer, Dean R. "The Importance of Faculty Attitudes in Planning for Instructional Development", Research in Higher Education, in press.

MOVERS

This feature is intended to keep our readers informed of the whereabouts of their professional colleagues. It is our intention to keep you informed about: (a) Who finally hired that promising graduate student your department was considering; (b) New addresses of veteran educators.

Our regular questionnaires keep us somewhat up-to-date, but we need your help. Please drop us a line when you move or when you know of a recent move by a colleague. Thanks. Send your information to:

EPISTLE
c/o Bob Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

NEW GRADUATES

. . .From Arizona State University

Ken Karloff, Assistant Professor of Reading
State University of New York at Fredonia

John Readence, Assistant Professor of Reading
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio

. . .From University of Georgia

Helen Baines, Adjunct Professor
University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida

James Joseph Bigaj, Reading Consultant
Milwaukee Public Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Janet Cox, Director of Reading
Greenville County Schools, Greenville, South Carolina

Elaine Ann Crable, Research & Evaluation Work/Study
National Testing Service, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

James Cunningham, Assistant Professor
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill
North Carolina

Jack Dalton, Assistant Professor
University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama

Jim Lanfrey, Reading Consultant
Judith Lanfrey, Reading Consultant
Council Rock School District, Richboro, Pennsylvania

Jim Melvin, Principal
Hillsman Middle School, Athens, Georgia

Susan G. Strader, Assistant Professor
Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia

Vera Thurmond, Assistant Professor & Director of Reading Programs
Paine College, Augusta, Georgia

. . .From Harvard University

Sean Walmsley, Assistant Professor
State University of New York, Albany, New York

. . .From University of Missouri at Kansas City

Alice Legenza, Associate Professor
Northeastern Illinois University

. . .From State University of New York at Albany

Natalie Findee, Assistant Professor
College of St. Rose

Robert Judge, Assistant Professor
College of St. Rose

. . .From University of Oregon

Maryann Haddock, Assistant Professor of Reading
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

. . .From University of Texas at Austin

Sarah Lopez, Assistant Professor of Reading and Bilingual Education
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

VETERAN RELOCATION

Jules Abrams, Professor
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Gary Anderson, Associate Professor of Reading
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Allen Berger, Professor
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

William E. Blanton, Professor
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina

Ronald Carver, Associate Professor
University of Missouri at Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

Joan Nelson, Professor
State University of New York at Binghamton
Binghamton, New York

Jim Peebles, Associate Professor
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Patricia Rigg, Assistant Professor
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York

Keith Thomas, Assistant Professor of Reading
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE . . . (July, 1975)

.....first the good news. According to a new "mini-assessment" conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for the Right To Read Program, 89% of 17 year-olds still in school are functionally literate. This finding is based on a survey of 5,200 17 year-olds. The criterion for demonstrating literacy is the ability to perform 75% of simple everyday tasks, such as reading road signs, maps, ads, forms, telephone books, medicine bottle labels and the like. The results of the 1974 study show a 2% improvement over the results of a similar survey conducted in 1971. Copies of the mini-assessment on functional literacy are available at no charge from NAEP, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 700, Denver, Colorado 80203.

.....other news includes word that Ruth Love Holloway is leaving her post as Head of Right To Read. She is returning to her native California to head the Oakland School System. A new director for Right To Read has not been announced.

.....With this issue of EPISTLE, Tony Manzo, co-originator of PRTE and EPISTLE moves from the position of Co-editor to Editorial Advisor. Kemble Oliver joins the EPISTLE staff as Assistant Editor. Kemble is a doctoral candidate at the University of Georgia.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Deborah De Nicolo is on leave from her position of directing reading programs for the New York State Department of Correctional Services, Youth Division. In that capacity she is responsible for program planning and in-service training in the state-wide network of Youth Development Camps. During her leave, she is completing residency requirements for a doctorate in reading at State University of New York at Albany. Previous to working on the doctorate, Ms. De Nicolo earned her bachelor's degree from Albany and the master's degree from Edinboro State College.

Jane Domaracki is currently working toward a doctorate in reading education at State University of New York at Albany. Earlier she completed both bachelors and masters work at Albany. Prior to returning to school, Mrs. Domaracki served as Speech Pathology and Audiology Teacher/Specialist for the Rensselaer-Columbia County Board of Cooperative Educational Services. She is also a certified teacher of the mentally retarded.

Lee Mountain holds an A.B. degree from George Washington University and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Penn State University. She taught at Penn State and Rutgers prior to her present position as Professor of education at University of Houston. Dr. Mountain has authored several reading texts and materials including New Dimensions in Language and the Challenge Readers published by McCormick-Mathers Publishers. Her professional articles have appeared in all of the major reading journals.

Robert A. Palmatier is an associate professor of reading education at the University of Georgia. He holds an A.B. degree from Houghton College and the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Syracuse University. Most recently, he has worked extensively in the areas of secondary reading and adult literacy.

Ronald Rood holds both bachelors and masters degrees from Ohio University. He entered teaching through the teacher corps program. He worked as a fifth-grade teacher for the Wood County, West Virginia Board of Education prior to returning to graduate school. Presently, Mr. Rood is a doctoral candidate in reading education at the University of Georgia.

Catherine Scheader is a school district reading specialist in New Jersey. Her master's degree was earned at Rutgers University. In addition to articles in professional journals, Mrs. Scheader is the author of five biographies of outstanding blacks in the Merrill Proud Heritage Series published by Charles E. Merrill Company.

for the next issue . . .

Jean Hiler outlines the competencies needed by a reading specialist in a community or junior college.

Gerald Parker and Barbara Ross analyze the competencies required to run a developmental/remedial reading program in a university.

Fred Raetch discusses the characteristics of reading staff necessary to work successfully with vocational school students and non-reading staff.

An article entitled: "Everyone Doesn't Need to Work in Teacher Training."

* * * *

coming in january . . .

How legislation at federal and state levels will affect graduate programs in reading.

coming in april . . .

Innovations in graduate level reading programs: what we have and what we need.

(Deadline for the April issue is March 1. If you would like to contribute, please let us know. Thanks.)

coming in july . . .

Report on the meeting in Anaheim.

* * * *

Regular Features

EXCHANGE

JOB REPORT

MOVERS

TIME CAPSULE